

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of March 7, 2006. Claims 1-24 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 15. Consequently, claims 1-24 remain pending in the present Application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 15 to recite that the high speed circuit has a frequency of greater than one GHz, while the tester has a frequency of less than one GHz. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in the specification, page 2, lines 13-17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 15, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6201,829 (Schneider) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,301,156 (Talley).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 1 and 15 recite a method and a system for testing a high speed circuit using a tester. Claims 1 and 15 recite obtaining a high-speed statistical signature of the high-speed circuit using a tester and comparing the high-speed statistical signature of the high-speed circuit to an expected signature. Claims 1 and 15 further recite that the high speed circuit has a first frequency of greater than one GHz, while the tester has a second frequency of not greater than one GHz. Thus, in addition to other benefits claims 1 and 15 may allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers. Specification, page 9, lines 1-10.

Schneider describes a system in which utilizes a tester that operate to provide a signal having a signal of greater than one GHz. Schneider, Abstract and col. 8, lines 48-57. In particular, the system of Schneider serializes a data stream to provide a signal of greater than one MHz. Consequently, the system of Schneider is configured to operate at the same frequency.

Stated differently, the generator/tester and the circuit being tested are configured to operate in the same frequency range.

Talley fails to remedy the defects of Schneider. The cited portion of Talley does describe a test signature generator. Talley, col. 7, lines 34-52. However, Applicant has found no mention in Talley of utilizing a tester that operates at a frequency operating in the same range as the circuit under test. Thus, if the teachings of Talley are added to those of Schneider, the combination may incorporate the signature generator of Talley into the system of Talley. However, the tester and the test signature generated would still have a frequency in the same range as circuit under test. Consequently, Schneider in view of Talley fail to teach or suggest the recited methods and system. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 15 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 23 depends upon independent claim 15. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claim 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is also allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2-9 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneider and Talley in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,559 (Wong).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 2-9 and 16-21 depend upon independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 2-9 and 16-21. In particular, Schneider in view of Talley fail to teach or suggest allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers.

Wong fails to remedy the defects of Schneider and Talley. Applicant agrees that the cited portion of Wong describe delays in the signals used. However, Applicant has found no mention in the cited portion of Wong of the tester having a frequency in a range outside the range of the

circuit being tested. Consequently, any combination of Schneider, Talley, and Wang fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Schneider in view of Talley in further view of Wong fail to teach or suggest the tester having a different frequency than the circuit being tested.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-9 and 16-21 are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claims 10 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneider and Talley in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,870,425 (Gunny).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 10 and 24 depend upon independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 10 and 24. In particular, Schneider in view of Talley fail to teach or suggest allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers.

Specification, page 9, lines 1-10.

Gunny fails to remedy the defects of Schneider and Talley. Applicant agrees that the cited portion of Gunny describe subtracting certain signals used. However, Applicant has found no mention in the cited portion of Gunny of the tester having a frequency in a range outside the range of the circuit being tested. Consequently, any combination of Schneider, Talley, and Gunny fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-9 and 16-21 are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneider and Talley and Gunny in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,019,899 (Boles).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 11 and 12 depend upon independent claim 1. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 11 and

12. In particular, Schneider in view of Talley and Gunny fail to teach or suggest allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers.

Boles fails to remedy the defects of Schneider, Talley, and Gunny. Applicant has found no mention in the cited portion of Boles of the tester having a frequency in a range outside the range of the circuit being tested. Consequently, any combination of Schneider, Talley, and Boles fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-12 are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneider and Talley and Wong.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 13 is analogous to independent claims 1 and 15. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claim 13. In particular, Schneider in view of Talley in further view of Wong fail to teach or suggest allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers.

The Examiner also rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneider, Talley, and Wong in further view of Gunny.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 14 depends upon independent claim 13. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claim 14. In particular, Schneider, Talley, and Wong fail to teach or suggest allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers.

Gunny fails to remedy the defects of Schneider, Talley, and Wong. As discussed above, Applicant has found no mention in the cited portion of Gunny of the tester having a frequency in a range outside the range of the circuit being tested. Consequently, any combination of

Schneider, Talley, Wong, and Gunny fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneider and Talley in further view of U.S. (Patent No. 5,212,601).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 22 depends upon independent claim 15. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claim 22. In particular, Schneider and Talley fail to teach or suggest allow testing of high frequency circuits using lower frequency, less expensive testers.

Wilson fails to remedy the defects of Schneider and Talley. Applicant has found no mention in the cited portion of Wilson of the tester having a frequency in a range outside the range of the circuit being tested. Consequently, any combination of Schneider, Talley, and Wilson fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

June 7, 2006  
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095  
Janyce R. Mitchell  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
(650) 493-4540